

Serial No. 10/708,938 – Davids et al.
Art Unit: 3742 – Attorney Docket 10015
Response to March 1, 2005 Claim Objections and Claim Rejections
Page 6 of 6

REMARKS

In the Office Action the Examiner issued a objections to Claim 1 because of the informalities: “the workpiece” recited in line 3 and “the said workpiece” recited throughout claim 1. Corrections to the informalities of Claim 1 have been made accordingly. The Examiner also issued a rejection of claims 1, 2, 4 and 5, wherein claims 2, 4 and 5 are ultimately dependant upon claim 1. Applicant has amended claim 1 and now believes that claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 are now allowable as Claim 1 provides a new method for the combination of workpiece movement and control of the traditional separate “scanning”, “lift and index” and “pop-up” movement and control methods into one invention. Claim 3 has been cancelled.

Respectfully submitted,



John K. McCormick
Registration No. 53527

Dated: April 19, 2005

I P Legal Center & McCormick Law Offices
6781 Glacier Drive
West Bend, WI 53090
Telephone: (262) 629-5100
Email: patentlaw@iplegalcenter.com

Customer No. 36483